





UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/972,078	10/05/2001	Evren Eryurek	P32.12-0019	4936
7590 04/21/2004			EXAMINER	
Judson K. Champlin WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY International Centre - Suite 1600 900 South Second Avenue			VOELTZ, EMANUEL T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2121	, 1
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3319			DATE MAILED: 04/21/2004) (


Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

d

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Antice Occasions	09/972,078	ERYUREK ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Emanuel T. Voeltz	2121
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 O</u>	<u>ctober 2001</u> .	
<i>,</i>	action is non-final.	
 Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E 		
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9 Total.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	

Office Action Summary



Art Unit: 2121



United States Patent and Trademark Office

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 2023I
www.uspto.gov

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

This action is in response to patent application number 09/972,078, filed October 5, 2001, which is a continuation of U.S. Serial No. 09/303,869, now U.S. Patent No. 6,397,114 B1, which is a divisional of U.S. Serial No. 08/623,569, now U.S. Patent 6,017,143.

Claims 1-30 have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on December 12, 2001, February 19, 2002, March 18, 2002, April 3, 2002, April 15, 2002, May 15, 2002, June 19, 2002, September 3, 2002 and September 30, 2002 are all in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statements.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Application/Control Number: 09/972,078

Art Unit: 2121

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-30 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-52 of U.S. Patent No. 6,397,114 B1.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in the patent set forth an inference engine means to determine the root cause diagnosis, wherein the instant application is using a model to do the same. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute a model scenario for determining root causes in an open loop control system rather than an inference engine. Both the modeling and the inference engine techniques are very much similar to one another. There would be no unexpected results from using one technique versus the other.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Emanuel Todd Voeltz** who may be reached via telephone at (703) 305-4563. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. eastern standard time.

Application/Control Number: 09/972,078

Art Unit: 2121

If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (703) 872-9306.

If you would like to send a Non-Official (draft) facsimile transmission the fax is (703) 746-5104.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor,

Anthony Knight, may be reached at (703) 308-3179.

Any response to this office action should be mailed too: Director of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231.

Moreover, hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist, located on the fourth floor of Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, Virginia.

Emanuel Todd Voeltz
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2121
United States Department of Commerce
Patent & Trademark Office

EMANÛÊL TODD VOELTZ PRIMARY FYAMMER